

159.
THE
CONSIDERATIONS

WHICH OBLIGED

PETER MANBY

DEAN of DERRY

To Embrace the CATHOLIQUE RELIGION.

Dedicated to His GRACE the LORD PRIMATE
of IRELAND. J. H. C.

Pfal. 42.

Judica me Deus & discerne causam meam de gente non sancta.

Emitte lucem tuam & veritatem tuam. Ipsa me deduxerunt & adduxerunt in Montem Sanctum tuum, & in Tabernacula tua.

Dublin Castle the 11th. of March 1687.

This following Discourse is allowed to be Printed.

Tbo: Sheridan.

London, Printed for Nathaniel Thompson at the entrance into the
Old Spring Garden, 1687.

154

1418. d. 42.

159.
THE

13. 24. i. L.

CONSIDERATIONS

WHICH OBLIGED

PETER MANBY

DEAN of DERRY

To Embrace the CATHOLIQUE RELIGION.

Dedicated to His GRACE the LORD PRIMATE
of IRELAND. J. H. C.

Pfal. 42.

Judica me Deus & discerne causam meam de gente non sancta.

*Emitte lucem tuam & veritatem tuam. Ipsa me deduxerunt & ad-
duxerunt in Montem Sanctum tuum, & in Tabernacula tua.*

Dublin Castle the 11th. of March 1687.

This following Discourse is allowed to be Printed.

Tbo: Sheridan.

London, Printed for Nathaniel Thompson at the entrance into the
Old Spring Garden, 1687.

154



[]

To the READER.

When a Protestant rehearſes this Article of his Creed, I believe one Holy Catholique and Apoſtolique Church, I would ſain underſtand what Church he means? whether the Church of England alone as eſtabliſht by Law, or the Church of England in Communion with other Churches? if the former, then his meaning is, I believe one Holy Proteſtant Church as ſettled in England by Act of Parliament. If the later, I deſire to know, with what other Church under the Heavens does the Church of England Communicate in Sacraments and Liturgy? whether with Lutherans, Calviniſts, Waldenſes or Greek Church? if with none of all theſe, why does he pretend to believe One Holy Catholique Church? this Church eſtabliſht by Law being Catholique neither as to time nor place; becauſe not viſible any where for many Ages before Edward VI.

Good Reader, if we believe our ſelves Catholiques, let us not fancy to our ſelves a Church divided from all the reſt of the world. And therefore I crave leave to ask St. Paul's Queſtion, What? came the Word of God out from you (the eſtabliſht Church) or came it unto you alone? 1 Cor. 14. 36. Hath the Divine Goodneſs left all the World in darkneſs except our Iſlands? and us too, for ſo many Ages until Henry VIII. took a fancy to Ann Bolen? Is the Catholique Church dwindled away to the Church of England? perhaps you will answer me, that by one Holy Catholique Church you underſtand all the variety of Proteſtants; as Church of England men, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Independents, Anabaptiſts, Fifth monarchy men, Quakers, &c. but all theſe wanting that firſt and eſſential mark of the Catholique Church call'd Unity, cannot be that one Holy Society intended by our Creed. And moreover, this makes Proteſtancy ſo wandring and uncertain a thing, that I for my part do not well underſtand it. Can you ſay that Lutherans & Church of England men are the ſame in all material points, the Lutherans holding a Corporal preſence

in the Sacrament, and the Church of England denying it: or that Calvinists and good Protestants are the same in all necessary matters, the former having no Orders of Priests and Bishops, consequently no true Sacraments, nor power of Binding and Absolving Sinners? besides, the Catholique Church can never fail: but as for those Sects of Protestants; Who ever saw or heard of them for many Ages before Henry VIII?

Well, but you will insist upon it that God hath his People amongst all sorts of Protestants; which answer I have sometimes heard out of the mouths of Protestants. And it calls to my mind those excellent words of the Late King's Second Paper, viz. The Protestants are not of the Church of England as 'tis the true Church from whence there can be no Appeal, but because the discipline of that Church is conformable at that present to their fancies, which as soon as it shall contradict or vary from, they are ready to embrace or join with the next Congregation of People, whose Discipline or Worship agrees with their own Opinion at that time, &c. And further it brings to my remembrance these words of a certain Person, once of my acquaintance; he was a Presbyterian, and gave his Son leave to go for New England to seek his Fortune. Why, said a Friend of his, they are all Independents there, and your Son will be in danger of losing his Principles: I care not what he be, replied the other, so he be not a Papist.

In a word (dear Reader) it concerns thee to understand aright that Article of thy Creed, I believe one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church; because the only way to be at rest in this World, and happy in the World to come, is to find out that Church upon whose Authority thou mayst rely. Noah's Dove found no rest for the sole of her Foot, until she returned into the Ark. No more wilt thou, but shalt be tossed too and fro upon the unstable waters of Schism, until thou return into the Ark of one Holy Catholique Church. I pray recollect what St. Paul admonishes concerning Schism. I beseech you Brethren by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye all spake the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, 1 Cor. i. 15. But that ye glorifie God with one mind and one mouth: That is, that

ye

ye serve God, not only saying the same things but the same words, especially about your Sacraments and Liturgy. For by one Spirit we (meaning all Christians) are Baptized into one Body. Therefore he exhorts them to take heed of such Teachers as have no Mission or Authority for what they say, but only good Words and fair Speeches to deceive the hearts of the simple.

In the following Discourse I hope the Reader shall find it briefly and yet fully made out to him, that the first Reformers had no Mission for what they did; nor any pretence to justifie their Separation and breach of Unity but only the Scripture as interpreted by themselves, not only without but against the Authority of the present Catholick Church: out of which a man may have all things except Salvation, said St. Augustin. And further he shall find me pressing for an Answer to such Questions as these, viz.

What Priesthood or Holy Orders had the first Reformers but what they received from the hands of Roman Catholique Bishops?

Whether a Presbyterian Minister, having received Orders from a Protestant Bishop, can by vertue of such Orders pronounce the Church of England a corrupt Church?

Whether Cranmer and his Associates could condemn the Church of Rome by pretence of the Mission they received from her Bishops?

Whether an Act of Parliament in France, Spain, or Germany, be not as good an Authority for Popery there, as in England for Protestantcy? And in case there be no Judg to determin who have the true sence of Scripture, Roman Catholiques or Protestants. Whether the Catholique sence be not as good as the Protestants?

Finally I intreat the Protestant Reader to peruse Dr. Heylin's History of the Reformation, a Book that speaks bitterly enough against Popery, yet as to matter of Fact, so honestly written, that, notwithstanding all Dr. Burnet's industry to diminish its credit, it hath opened the Eyes of many good Protestants. See Dr. Burnet's character of it in his Preface to his first Volume, where he censures it not for telling untruths in matter of History, but rather for speaking too much truth. He doubts not but Dr. Heylin was a sincere Protestant but violently carried away by some particular conceits, (these are Burnet's

Burnet's words: and is not to be excused that he never vouched any Authority for what he writ, &c. *This is the worst he could say, and 'tis an untruth that Heylin writ upon uncertain grounds as Dr. Burnet would insinuate. For thus Heylin himself will satisfy the Reader in the Preface to his History, viz.* As for my performance in this work; in the first place I am to tell thee, that towards the raising of this Fabrick, I have not borrowed my materials only out of vulgar Authors, but searched into the Registers of the Convocation, consulted all such Acts of Parliament as concerned my purpose, advised with many Foreign Writers of great name and credit, exemplified some Records and Charters of no common Quality, many rare Pieces in the Famous Cottonian Library, and not a few Debates and Orders of the Council Table: And next I am to let thee know that in the whole carriage of this Work I have assumed unto my self the freedom of a just Historian, delivering nothing for a Truth without good Authority; but so delivering the Truth as to witness for me that I am neither byassed by Love or Hatred. If I seem sharp at any time, as sometimes I may, it is but in such cases only and on such occasions in which there is no good to be done by lenitives, &c. *I have transcribed this passage, lest the Reader should be imposed on by Burnet's character of the ingenious Heylin, whose History he would disparage to advance the reputation of his own. And I pray the Reader to observe that Dr. Burnet does not instance one passage of any moment in all Heylin's Work, wherein that he dares say he is false, which certainly he would have done, had he found any such.* But he delivers many things in such a manner and so strangely, that one would think (*says Burnet*) he had been secretly set on by those of the Church of Rome, though I doubt not but he was a sincere Protestant, &c. *But what sort of People they were who set on Dr. Burnet to write his History is very well known. I will instance some passages out of Heylin, which I suppose did not please Dr. Burnet, viz. All that was done in order to a Reformation under Henry VIII seemed to be accidental only, and by the by; rather designed on private ends than out of any settled purpose to Reform the Church, and therefore inter-*

mitted

[1]

mitted and resumed again as those ends had variance. But now the work was carried on with a constant hand (under Edward VI.) the Prelates of the Church cooperating with the King and his Council, &c. And scarce had they brought it to this pass when King Edward dyed, whose death I cannot reckon for an infelicity to the Church of England (saith the Doctor.) For being ill princip'd in himself, and easily inclined to embrace such Councils as were offered to him, it is not to be thought but that the rest of the Bishopricks (before sufficiently impoverished) must have followed the Fate of *Durham*, and the poor Church be left as destitute of Lands and Ornaments as when she came into the World in her natural nakedness. Nor was it like to happen otherwise in the following Reign (to wit, of the Lady Jane Grey) if it had lasted longer then a nine days wonder. For *Dudly Duke of Northumberland*, who then rul'd the roast, and had before dissolved, and in hope devoured the wealthy Bishoprick of *Durham*, might easily have possessed himself of the Bishopricks of *Tork* and *Carlisle*. &c. *Dudly's Son was Married to the said Lady Jane Proclaimed Queen*, to maintain whose Interest and Title, the poor remainder of the Churches Patrimony was in all probability (says *Heylin*) to have been shared amongst those of that Party to make 'em sure; but the wisdom of this great *Achitophel* (*Dudly*) being turned to foolishness, he fell into the hands of the publick Hangman, &c. Reader, behold the spirit of Reformation which Governed those times. They are *Heylin's* own words.

But what is all this (you will say) to *Cranmer* and other Clergy-men, whose intentions of Reformation were sincere and honest? As for *Cranmer* then, you may judge of his spirit by what I shall remark to you presently out of *Doctor Burnet's Records*. Only observe the *Duke of Somerset's History* in short, thus out of *Heylin*. Being condemn'd to dye by his own Brethren of the Reformation, he was so defective in his judgment, as not to crave the benefit of his Clergy, which might have saved his life; whether it were some secret judgment on him from above, that he who had destroyed so many Churches, invaded the estate of so many Cathedrals, deprived so many learned men of their means and livelihood (for being Pa-pists)

piffs) should want the benefit of Clergy in his greatest extremity, &c. Observe the remarkable fates of those grand Reformers. Now as for Cranmer's spirit, take notice of it from his own words recorded by Dr. Burnet, which the Reader may consult, to save me the labour of transcribing. One or two passages I cannot omit: Cranmer, with the rest of the English Bishops, being desired to return their Answers severally to this Question; Whether in the New Testament be required any Consecration of a Bishop or Priest? Cranmer Answers thus under his hand viz. In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Priest or Bishop, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture, for election thereunto is sufficient. In which Assertion, all the rest of the Bishops except one, were against him.

And being consulted about another Question. Whether Bishops and Priests only may excommunicate by Gods Law? To which he returns this Answer under his hand VIZ. A Bishop or a Priest, by the Scripture, is neither commanded nor forbidden to excommunicate, but where the Laws of any Countrey give them Authority to Excommunicate, there they ought to use the same in such Crimes as the Laws have such Authority in. And where the Laws of the Countrey forbid them, there they have no Authority at all. And they that be no Priests may also Excommunicate, if the Law allow thereunto. Here he had the spirit of Hobbs of Malmesbury.

And about another Question, whether by Authority of Christs words, quorum remisimus peccata, remittuntur illis, Christians are bound to confess their secret sins to a Priest? He answered in the negative against all the rest of the Bishops except one. Let the Reader consult Burnet, and compare him with Heylin; in both which it will appear, that the Grand Reformers, Somerset, Dudley, &c. made their Breakfast only of Abby Lands, intending to Dine upon the Bishops Lands. Burnet strains all his wit to palliate their doings, and paint them out to advantage. Heylin represents them honestly for the most part and in their own colours; and in my poor opinion, writes more truth, and better English: He was full of a generous indignation to see so much Stripping and Plundering of Gods House under pretence of Reforming it.

Tu abominaris Idola & Sacrilegium facis Rom. i. 22.

FAREWEL



May it please Your Grace,

I Humbly beg leave to send Your Grace this short Account of my Reconcilement to the Catholick Church.

God be praised it was not any consideration of Temporal Interest that inclin'd me to it, as all that have known me these several years past can witness. But having often reflected on the uncertainty and variety of the Protestant Spirit, and perused the Books of Catholicks without prejudice, especially the Mass it self, I found my self deceiv'd by the Reports which I had entertained of Catholick Religion.

T Here are three Points chiefly wherein I could never satisfy my self, since I began to study the Controversy between both Churches. One is the Authority or *Mission* of the first Reformers. The second is the want of *Confession* in the Church of *England*. The third is the Answer given by Protestants to that Question in his late Majesties Papers, *Where is that one Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church which we do profess to believe in the two Creeds?*

As to the first, I have seen Dr. *Bramhall's* and Mr. *Mason's* Vindications of the Church of *England*; but could never find any satisfactory Answer to this Question, Who authoriz'd the first Reformers to Preach their Protestant Doctrine, and Administer their Protestant Sacraments? Their Priestly or Episcopal Character, whether valid or no, I meddle not with to prevent Disputes: although I think it no easy matter to find out who Ordained the first Protestant Bishops; there being none to do it

B

except

except Roman Catholick Prelates, who never use to Consecrate any Protestants. This testimony I lately met with in the Records annexed to Dr. Burnet's second Volume of his History of Reformation.

In the Month of *March* anno 1553. *Queen Mary* sent this, amongst other Articles, to the Bishop of *London*, viz. *Touching such persons as were heretofore* (meaning the days of *Edward 6.*) *promoted to any Orders after the new sort and fashion of Orders, considering they were not ordered in very deed, the Bishop of the Diocese finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before, and then according to his discretion admit them to minister, &c.* This royal testimony, with the honest Protestant Reader, will not be despicable. I shall not insist upon it, but only observe at present that *Cranmer*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Latimer* Bishop of *Worcester*, at the time of their Consecration were professed *Roman Catholicks* in all points, except perhaps the Pope's Supremacy; but afterwards turning *Protestants*, and pronouncing the Church of *Rome* *Idolatrous*, I would fain know by whose Authority.

The truth is, they were first Ordain'd Catholick Bishops according to the Roman *Pontifical*, and afterwards made themselves Protestant Bishops. But I understand not how a man can forsake the Church of *England*; and Preach Presbyterian Doctrine by vertue of his Protestant Orders; nor how any man can justify his Protestant Doctrine by authority of his Popish Mission.

This was *Cranmer's* and *Latimer's* case, who at the time of their Consecration (which was in the days of *Henry 8.*) professed seven Sacraments; whether they believed so many, is a question: afterwards, anno 1536. retrenched them to three, that is to say, Baptism, Penance, and the Lord's Supper: then to two, anno 1549. By whose Authority or Mission, I cannot tell. So that *Protestancy* seems to me to have been born into the World not like honestly begotten children, whose Parents are known, but rather like a by-blow, whose Father is doubtful. I have known some Presbyterians, when questioned about their Mission, pretend they did receive:

receive it from Church of *England* Prelates; but being further interrogated, did that Church Authorize you to Preach against her Sacraments or Liturgy? there was no Answer to be had. I know it will be said that the Protestant Religion is Authoriz'd by Act of Parliament, and so is not Presbytery. A *Parliamentary* Mission then our first Reformers had, and no other that I can find. But whether the Parliament, being a Civil Authority, has power to send Missioners to preach the Gospel, and administer Sacraments, I do not well understand. If they have, I suppose every Member of Parliament may preach and administer Sacraments if he pleases; because no man can give that Authority unto others which he hath not himself. And if *English* Parliaments may preach and administer Sacraments, I doubt not but the *French*, *Spanish*, *Scottish*, and *Irish* may do the same; and then what unity of Spirit or agreement in Faith Christians are like to have, I could never understand.

To this, two Answers are wont to be given, which I will not conceal from the Reader. One is, that *Cranmer* and his Associates were sent and ordered by the *Roman Pontifical* to instruct the people according to the *Scriptures*. This is the Answer of Dr. *Burnet*. *The Church* (saith he) *was overrun with Errors and Corruptions, this Cranmer saw, and was obliged to undeceive the people.* Very good. But I intreat the Reader to inspect the Records aforesaid, published by the Doctor himself, and annexed to the first and second Volume of his History: where he shall find *Cranmer* and one or two Bishops more pretending Errors and Corruptions, and driving on a *Reformation* against the major Vote of the *English* Bishops. He shall find the same *Cranmer* at the time of his Consecration owning & professing those very Doctrines which afterwards he called Errors & Corruptions; so that still I must ask the old Question, by whose Authority did he condemn that Church from whom he received his Mission and holy Orders? I desire to know whether an honest man can preach against the Liturgy, Sacraments, or Constitution of any Church by vertue of any Commission he received from it: and whether such

Preacher be not liable to the Censures of that Church? did ever any Church authorize her Priests or Bishops to go and preach the Gospel after their own private Sense or Conscience in contradiction to her declared Doctrine and Worship? does the Church of *England* give any such Power at this day? No by no means. Read the *Form* appointed by her for the Ordination of a Priest, where the Bishop is to interrogate the Party thus, *viz Do you think in your heart that you be truly called according to the order of this Church of England to the Order and Ministry of Priesthood?* The Answer is, *I think so. Will you then* (saith the Protestant Bishop) *give your diligence always to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments as this Church and Realm hath received the same according to the Commandments of God?* The Answer is, *I will do so by the help of God?*

So that as no honest man can turn *Presbyterian* or *Independant* Preacher by vertue of his *Protestant* Mission; so neither can he preach *Protestant* Doctrine by pretence of a Commission he received from the Church of *Rome*. If any body should ask me, what if the Church be manifestly corrupted with Superstition and Idolatry? in this case why may not able men preach without any Mission? I must beg leave to ask him again, What if the Church finds those Men of Abilities manifestly intoxicated with mistakes of Holy Scripture? with a Spirit of perverseness and a desire of change? or perhaps an evil Eye at the *Lands* of the Church? what is to be done in this case! Let the *Scripture* (he will say) determine the business: But the *Scripture* admits of various interpretations: and I would fain know what Rebel or Heretique shall ever be convicted that must be tryed by a *Law* whereof himself must be the Interpreter?

Well, but *Cranmer*, tho he had no Mission to reform, was perhaps a Holy Man: as for his Sanctity, the Reader may be pleased to see him subscribing to a Letter in *Foxes Acts and Monuments* for excluding his Lawful Sovereign the Princess *Mary* from Succession to the Crown: and afterwards recanting the Protestant Religion, and relapsing into it again when he saw no hopes of a reprieve.
The

The truth is, when I reflect that *Cromwell* and he were the chief Engineers of the Reformation, first to Divorce *Henry VIII.* from his most vertuous and innocent Wife *Queen Katherin*, then to Marry him to *Ann Bolen*, and afterwards to dissolve that Marriage: Then to destroy Religious Houses, and hang up the poor Abbots; disband Four or Five Sacraments; set the People a madding after New Lights: I cannot but look upon those two Politicians as the Ring-leaders of all that Confusion and Mischief which has since broke out upon the Stage of Great *Britain*.

So much for the former Answer that *Cranmer* and his Associates were sent and ordained by the *Roman Pontifical* to teach the people according to the Scriptures, which they did according to their *own sence* of the Scriptures.

If it be said that he preached no new Doctrine, nor administered any new Sacraments, but only the Primitive Doctrine and Sacraments of Jesus Christ according to the sence of the Antient *Fathers*, which is the second Answer: I pray the Reader to remember that this was the very answer of *Luther*, *Socinus*, *Zuinglius*, *Calvin*, and most other Reformers. I am not now disputing what Doctrine he preached? but who sent him to preach his *Protestant* Doctrine, and Administer his *Protestant* Sacraments? 'Tis not his Doctrine but *Mission* that I am now enquiring after. *How shall they preach except they be sent*, saith *St. Paul*. 'Tis not a pretence of true Doctrine without external and lawfull Mission that makes a man a Preacher of the Gospel. The necessity of *Mission* appears from God's own word, *Jerem. 23. I have not sent these Prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied*, vers. 21. *therefore they shall not profit this people at all saith the Lord*, vers. 32.

There are but two sorts of Mission in Holy Scripture, the one Ordinary, the other Extraordinary: The former is the Licence and Approbation of the Church in being: The later is the immediate Voice and Inspiration of God himself ever attested by Miracles, prediction of future and publick Events, &c. Now as for the first Preachers of *Reformation*, some body must send them
by

by an Ordinary or Extraordinary Commission, or they must run of their own heads. *Fur & latro est* (saith St. Cyprian) *qui a nemine missus nisi a seipso*: that is to say, he enters not by the Door as honest men do, but seeks Windows, Corners, or By-ways of his own; as if the Divine Providence were wanting (when necessity requires) to send Preachers into the Church, or to furnish them with sufficient *Credentials* so as to leave us without excuse. Did not the Hand of God strike *Uzzah* with sudden death for presuming to put forth his hand, uncommanded, to support the Ark from falling, 2 Sam. 6. And King *Uzziah* with a Leprosie to the day of his death for offering Incense which appertained to the Priests alone? Are not these things recorded for our instruction?

The not considering this matter hath brought a world of confusion upon these Kingdoms; and till the People can be brought to understand it, we are never like to see an end of our Religious Distractions. For why may not I (may a *Presbyterian* Minister say) having the same authority of Scripture which *Cranmer* pretended to, preach against the *superstition* of *Common prayer*, as well as he against the *Idolatry* of the *Mass*?

The Second point wherein I was dissatisfied was the want of *Confession* to a Priest. I found Protestant Sermons had some Authority with the people, but not much for lack of this *Curb* upon their Vices. *Catholiques* commit sin, 'tis true; but call themselves to an account for it by Confession and Submission to their Ghostly Fathers. Protestants sin likewise without calling themselves to any such reckoning; because they can make a shift without it.

I have divers times discoursed with Protestant Ministers, and some Protestant Bishops about this matter. I was sorry to find no harmony in their opinions. Some said 'twas a thing allow'd by the Church of *England* as very expedient in some cases, but no matter of necessity. Others thought it but a picklock of secrets, and a matter of ill consequence. But when I urg'd that the Church of
England

England seems to require, it in her Offices for the Communion and Visitation of the Sick, the reply was, she does it with this proviso, *if a man be troubled with any doubts or scruples*; Which reply did but add more to my dissatisfaction. For thought I, is Confession nothing else but to be resolv'd in our scruples and doubts? I have sometimes wished her exhortation before the Communion, otherwise worded then saying, *if there be any of you which cannot quiet his own Conscience, let him come to me. or some other Learned Minister of Gods Word, and open his grief, &c.* Which words seem to allow as much as that sinners may satisfy their own Consciences well enough without troubling themselves for the *Abolution* of a Priest, although a Priest may be had.

In short, I confess my dulness understands neither the Piety nor Policy of leaving off the practise of a *thing* so approved and frequented by all the Christian World, except the people of our Islands, and some few others that call themselves *Reformed*. And that only for some *abuses* which possibly may attend it. By this means the Church of *England* appears to me to have lost that interest in the Consciences of the people, which both the *Roman* and *Greek* Priests are happy in at this day.

And what if some Catholicks are never the better for it? what are many Protestants the better for all the Sermons they hear, and Sacraments they receive? *If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins*, saith St. John. Faithful and just to what? even to his own promise which he hath thrice repeated in the Gospel, *Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them*. But other promise that he will do it without the ministry of his Priests, we read not of in the New Testament. I pray the Reader to consider whether private Sinners in the Church of *England* do not offend God at a much cheaper rate then in the Church of *Rome*; since in the Church of *Rome* they are bound to some Penance: But in the Church of *England* they may confess to their Ministers and do Penance if they will, or if they will not, they may let it alone. *If they cannot satisfy their own Consciences* (saith the Common prayer) *let them come to me, or*
some

some other discreet and learned Minister, and open their grief, &c. that Christians may receive the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood without a previous Confession and Absolution by a Priest, was never heard of in the Catholique Church until the days of Henry VIII.

The third difficulty was the Answer given by Protestants to that Question in the Late Kings Papers, *Where is that one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church which we do profess to believe in the two Creeds?* Was there any such Society as one *Holy Catholique Church* extant upon the face of the earth when *Cranmer* began his Reformation? and what Provinces of the Earth did this Church inhabit? This is a plain Question, and desires no Answer but of the *ubi* or place where to find it. This Society, if it be not an *Idea Platonica*, must appear somewhere. And when that is known, the next Doubt is, Did *Cranmer* believe himself a Member of it? and if so, I would fain know who gave him authority to Reform this *one Holy Catholique and Apostolique Church*? to set up Altar against Altar, &c. if there were no such Church extant upon the face of the earth, as there must be none in case she were lapsed into *Idolatry*, what became of our Saviours prediction, that the *Gates of Hell shall never prevail against his Church*? I am told that Dr. *Sceet* has answered these Questions by saying that the Church of *Rome* are Idolaters, and yet a true Church at the same time: Which Answer I confess I do not understand. For what agreement hath the Temple of God with Idols, (saith St. Paul) and what concord hath Christ with Belial? for ye are the Temple of the Living God, what communion hath light with darkness? 2 Cor. 6. 16. What? Idolaters and yet a true Church? 'tis as much as to say they are in the way to Heaven and Hell at the same time. But such Answers must be given when there are no better. I confess I never read this Answer in him, I only have it by hearsay. Surely, to teach and practise *Idolatry* destroys the very being of a Christian Church. And if the Church of *Rome* be no Christian Church, there

there is an end of the Episcopal *Succeſſion* of the Church of *England*, and conſequently of the Church it ſelf.

To conclude, that which obliged me moſt of all to the Church of *Rome*, was the peruſal of her Books of Devotion : ſuch as Saint *Francis Sales* Biſhop of *Geneva* his *Introduction to a Devout Life*. Neirembergius of the *difference betwixt Time and Eternity*. Lewis Granatenſis of the *Love of God*. Kempis of the *following of Chriſt*, &c. Eſpecially the *Maſs* it ſelf : which I read without prejudice, and compared the *Spirit* of Piety, which I found there, with the *Spirit* of Reformation.

In ſtead of Idolatry, I found the moſt elevated and judicious Prayers to the Holy Trinity ; concluding in the Name of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt ; beſides the daily Sacrifice offered up to Almighty God according to his own appointment, *Do this in remembrance of me*. All this I obſerved, and then ſaid within my ſelf, God forgive the wickedneſs of thoſe people who quarrel at this, and perſecute it with ſo blind and furious an averſion. So did the *Jews* crucify our Saviour.

What fault can any ingenuous Proteſtant find with this or any other Prayer of the *Maſs*? *Suſcipe ſancte Pater, omnipotens æterne Deus hanc immaculatam hoſtiam quam ego indignus famulus tuus offero tibi Deo meo vivo & vero*, &c. Accept, O holy Father Almighty and Eternal God, this unſpotted Sacrifice which I thy unworthy Servant offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable ſins, offences and negligences, and for all here preſent, as alſo for all faithful Chriſtians both living and dead, that it may avail both me and them unto everlaſting life, *Amen*. If this be the *Maſs*, who but a perverſe ill natur'd *Phanatick* can except againſt it?

As for the *Confiteor* ſaid at the beginning of *Maſs*, the Reader ſhall find Proteſtants objecting nothing againſt it, but what Presbyterians do againſt that *Canticle* in the Common Prayer-Book, called *Benedicite omnia opera*. O *Ananias*, *Azarias* and *Miſael*, *praiſe ye the Lord*, is as rank Popery with the Presby-

terians, as any thing in the *Mafs*, or Litanies of our Lady. For what's that (say they) but to invoke dead men, who don't hear us. Thus they will interpret it in their *own sense*, and not in the sense of the *Church of England*.

In a word, I found the *Church of England* beholding to the *Mafs* for the best Flowers in her Communion Service. And since some Protestants will believe nothing but their *senses*, let them read it as I have done, and believe their own eyes. The objection of its being said in the *Latin Tongue*, allows every man to hear it that understands *Latin*. And as for unlearned Catholicks, if the truth were known, they understand as much or more of it than *illiterate* Protestants do of the Common-Prayer. What does the Protestant Multitude understand of the predictions of *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*, *Daniel*, *Zechariah* read in their Churches by appointment of the Common Prayer? How many Expositions of the *Mafs* are extant in Print by commandment of the Church? so that no man can be ignorant of it that desires to be informed. How much more universal and vulgar is the *Latin* then the *English* Tongue? Had not the *Jewish* Church (being then the only true Church in the World) almost all her Scriptures and publick Service for *fourteen Generations*, that is to say, from the Captivity of *Babylon* unto Christ in the old *Hebrew*? a Language not then understood by the common people. Did our Saviour or his Apostles ever reprehend the *Jews* for this? or for not translating their Scriptures into the vulgar Language? If the Service of God must be said in the maternal Language of every Nation, where shall an *English* man in *France* or *Spain*, that understands not the Language, go to serve God upon the *Lord's Day*? This would destroy all community of Sacraments and Liturgy between the members of the Catholic Church; which being *one Body* or Society of men, cannot be like the Builders of *Babel*, who could not understand one anothers Language. Now I beseech you Brethren, (saith Saint Paul,)

Paul,) by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, that ye may with one mind and one mouth Glorify God: 1 Cor. I. 10. Rom. 15. 6.

In fine, let the Reader compare that Devotion which Catholicks pay to the *Sacrifice* of the *Mass*, with that which most Protestants shew to the Common Prayer, and then see how much better we are by *reforming* the *Mass* into *English*. As for Saint Paul's 14th Chapter of his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, I humbly think it not well understood by Protestants. If any man be ignorant, saith he, let him be ignorant. Wherefore Brethren; covet to Prophecy, and forbid not to speak with tongues, ver. 39. God is not the Author of Confusion, but of Peace, ver. 33.

Upon the whole matter, I desire to be inform'd whether the Protestant Church had any other foundation (setting aside an Act of Parliament) then every man's own *reason*, or which is the same thing, the Scripture interpreted by every man's reason. There are but two *Bases* whereupon to settle our selves, the *Scripture* and *Fathers* expounded by my own reason, or the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* expounded by the voice of the present Visible Church. This later is *Popish* and cannot support a Reformed *Fabrick*.

I have sometimes wonder'd at this Assertion of Calvin. *Instit. Lib. 4. Cap. 1.* (so incoherent with his own *Principles* of *Reformation*), *extra Ecclesiæ gremium nulla speranda salus nec remissio peccatorum, quia non est alius in vitam ingressus*; which I think may be thus rendered into English; He that will enter into Life, let him mortifie the pride of his own Reason, and humbly cast himself at the feet of the *Catholic Church*. If this be the meaning of his words, as it must be in case he believed any such thing as *one Holy Catholic Church*; how he will justify his *Reformation* at the day of Judgment, I cannot imagin.

In this Paper therefore I presume not to assert my own *reason* (which I confess to be as weak as any body else can think it) but the Authority of the *Church* against the *Arrogance* of the first *Reformers*. This difference I understand betwixt the spirit of *Catholiques* and of *Heretiques*; the former make use of their Reason with submission, the later with contradiction and *petulancy* against the Church; and against the expresse words of Christ, *he that heareth you, heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me*.

Cranmer had no mission from Heaven, nor yet from the present visible Church to authorise his doings; but made himself *Judg, Witness, and Accuser*. So did *Luther*, so did *Calvin*, *Socinus*, *Knipperdoling*, &c. how they will answer it at the last day I cannot understand.

A word or two more before I make an end. I know divers loyal Persons of the Church of *England*, who are *Protestants* by the tyranny of Prejudice or interest, but *Catholiques* by inclination: of them I beg leave to ask a few Questions. What Priesthood or Holy Orders have *Protestants* but what they confess to have received from Roman Catholique Bishops? who gave them authority to pronounce themselves *sound Members*, and the Church of *Rome* a *corrupt Arm* of the Catholique Church? did not the *Presbyterians*, anno 1641, pretend the very same warrant of Scripture for Reforming the Church of *England*? and the *Independents* for supplanting the *Presbyterians*, anno 1647. the *Presbyterians* (said *Hugh Peters*) are no other then *Gibconites* who may help to bew *Stones* and *square Timber* for a more glorious *Reformation*.

Now as for Roman Catholiques, do they ever say *Mass* to any other Object but the *Living God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*? read the *Catechism* of the Council of *Trent*, and see whether they attribute any thing to *Angels* or *Saints*, but as the Ministers and Favourites of the Living God, receiving from him whatever understanding they may have of our
Affairs

Affairs upon earth. The Angels must know our Affairs, because *they are ministring Spirits sent forth for the good of those who shall be heirs of Salvation*; and because they rejoice at the conversion of Sinners: and have *glorified Saints* no communication or intelligence with the *Angels*? As for the *Images* of Christ's humane nature, see the 25th. Session of the Council of *Trent*, and enquire whether Roman Catholiques pay any more respects to them then Protestants do to the Elements of Bread and Wine, which (say they) are but a Figure or *Image* of Christ's Body and Blood. *Omnis Superstitio in imaginum usu sacro tollatur*, saith that Council; Let all Superstition be taken away in the use of Images; and then gives it in charge to all Bishops to look to it. The Church of *England* Protestants are every jot as offensive to us (say the *Presbyterians*) kneeling before the Elements of Bread and Wine, as the *Papists* kneeling before the *Images* of Christ. I humbly recommend to Protestants the perusal of a late Book entituled *Pax Vobis*: and of another styled *Considerations upon the Council of Trent*, by R. H.

I say no more, only give thanks to Almighty God with all my heart, that I am escaped out of the unstable waters of *Schism* into the Ark of Christ's Church. And I beseech him to inspire me with that *Spirit* of Devotion which I observ'd in the *Mass* & other Books of *Catholicks*. As for the ill practices of some, and the ill opinions of other Roman Catholicks, which Protestants are wont to charge upon the whole Church, I pass it over as no Argument at all: all Protestants are no more Saints, then all *Papists*. In the Council of *Trent* an unprejudic'd Reader shall find nothing but what is judicious and pious. And let him view *Popery* not as *Protestants*, but as *Papists* represent it, who should best know their own Religion.

In the Church of *Rome* he shall find variety of Religious Orders, but no *Schism*, nor discord about their Sacraments or Liturgy. *In veste Ecclesiæ varietas est, scissura non est*. No confusion

fusion of Sects, nor disobedience to Superiors; but all things perform'd in excellent order, and God Almighty serv'd, as he is the Creator and Emperor of the world, with Reverence and distance.

O quam dilecta sunt Tabernacula tua Domine virtutum! concupiscit & deficit Anima mea in Atria Domini. Beati qui habitant in domo tuâ, in Sæcula Sæculorum laudabunt te. Amen. Psal. 84.

P. S.

IF any Protestant Reader, instead of a material Answer to this Discourse, shall think fit to revile the Author, 'tis but what I expect, and what I intend to take no notice of. But I intreat him to read the following *Quæries* without his Spectacles of *Prejudice* and *Interest*.

Dubia quædam super Reformatione Anglicanâ.

E*ccllesia Anglicana vel est tota Ecclesia Catholica vel membrum illius, si membrum duntaxat, ostende mihi sub sole Ecclesiam vel cætum cujus Sacramenta amplectitur, nisi sit à reliquo corpore abscissum?*

Num recipit Sacramenta Lutheranorum vel Calvinistarum?

Unde Missus est Cranmerus primus ille Reformator Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ? quis misit illum ad prædicandum Evangelium suum Reformatum? utrum licitum ei vel honestum fuerit rebellare adversus Ecclesiam Romanam virtute Missionis ab ea acceptæ.

An liceat Episcopo vel Ministro ab Ecclesia Anglicana fugitivo prædicare contra eam obrentu Ministerii ab ea collati?

Utrum

Utrum defectus Missionis sit error in fundamentis ? ratio dubitandi est, quia furtum & latrocinium est non ingredi per Ostium in Ovile.

Utrum Cranmerus intravit per Ostium Parliamentarium vel forsan per Portam Scripturarum ? at hæc est cantilena omnium Sectariorum scripturas sibi vendicantium. Quæro igitur nonne varius & multiplex est Scripturarum sensus ? unde necesse est assignari Judicem aliquem qui verum sensum a falso dijudicet, nisi mavis altercari in æternum.

Ad hæc Postulata sæpius quæsvi responsum sed nullum hæctenus inveni. Si dixeris (quod à multis obtendi solet) Cranmerum cum suis sodalibus Ordines Sacros accepisse à Christo & Apostolis per manus Episcoporum Pontificiorum, sequitur Episcopos Pontificios suos etiam Ordines à Christo & Apostolis accepisse. Sunt ergo veri pastores ac proinde Audiendi. Hoc responso videntur mihi jugulare causam suam Protestantes. At, inquires, Episcopi Pontificii ordines suos non doctrinam acceperunt à Christo & Apostolis; egregie. Cupio ergo doceri quâ Autoritate insurrexerunt Primi Reformatores adversus doctrinam Ecclesiæ Romanæ ? aut hic nodus solvendus est, aut simul agis & Judicem & testem & accusatorem.

Sed plerumq; responderi solet cuilibet Genti competere jus reformandi seipsam: esto. Ergo pari jure reformata fuit gens Scotica ad Calvinismum, Saxonica ad Lutheranismum, &c. deinde falsum est quod facta erat mutatio Religionis in Anglia ex voto Gentis & cleri Anglicani, sed ex Vertigine paucorum res novas quærentium sub pueritia Edwardi Sexti. Lege illorum temporum Annales, ubi palam est Episcopos fere omnes (Cranmero & paucis aliis exceptis) à novo Evangelio abhorruisse.

Cæterum dato hoc & non concesso, nempe reformatam fuisse Religionem ex mente potioris partis Cleri Anglicani; nescio an licuit Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, cum esset Membrum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, se met abscindere à reliquo corpore. Si dixeris hoc factum fuisse non vitio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sed Romanæ corruptelas suas Orbi obtrudentis,

trudentis, respondeo breviter, quòd se Iudice omnis hæreticus absoluitur. Præterea animadvertat Lector hoc ipsum solere obijci ab omnibus Presbyterianis defectionem suam ab Ecclesia Anglicana excusantibus, nimirum se reliquisse nonnisi errores & corruptelas Anglicanæ Religionis.

An per univèrsum Orbem depravatus sit verus Dei cultus ante ortum Cranmerum? si non, dic mihi ubinam gentium extiterit? an apud Waldenses? at nescio unde missus est Petrus Waldo Mercator Lugdunensis? nec scio an ejus Sacramenta placeant Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.

Utrum hodiè extra Regnum Angliæ & Hyberniam nullus extet purus & Apostolicus Dei cultus?

Utrum liceat populo Anglicano comminisci sibi Ecclesiam à toto Orbe divisam? qua Autoritate damnat Sacramenta & Ritus Ecclesiæ Romanæ?

Utrum Cranmerus fuit primus Archiepiscopus Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ? ratio dubitandi est, quia Archiepiscopi Cantuarienses per novem antecedentia sæcula fuerunt omnes Pontificii. Si primus fuit, ergo defuit ei successio Episcopalis, quia primus suæ Sectæ nulli successit. An fuerit legitimus Pastor cui deerant successio, missio & miracula?

Utrum sit vera Ecclesia quæ non habet legitimos Pastores? vel an possint esse vera Sacramenta apud Pastores non veros? si non, ergo præstat communicare sub una specie cum Catholicis quam sub nullâ cum Reformatis.

Utrum 39 Articuli Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sint Articuli fidei vel non? si non, ergo nemo tenetur fidem habere illis sub periculo salutis. Si sic, ergo Ecclesia Anglicana novos excogitavit fidei Articulos præter duodecim illos à Christo & Apostolis institutos.

Utrum Religio reformatâ sit divisibilis in semper divisibiles?

An in re Eucharistica Argumentum à sensibus ductum sit fallibile? ratio dubitandi est quia Serpens primos fefellit Parentes suadendo

suadendo illis ut suis crederent oculis, ut scilicet comederent de ligno scientiæ quia erat pulchrum oculis. Quod si ab oculis suis deceptum fuit genus humanum, quæso ando plus fidei meruerunt cæteri sensus ?

Utrum Ecclesia Anglicana mutabilis sit ad nutum Parliamenti?

Utrum Spiritus Calvini negantis ac Lutheri affirmantis corporalem Christi præsentiam in Eucharistia sint idem ? si diversi, ergo uterq; à Deo esse non potest.

Nonne impudentissimus fuit Johannes Calvinus usurpato sibi munere reformandi Orbem cum Juvenis esset viginti sex annorum, idq; absq; omni prætextu miraculorum, quod nè ipse Christus susceperat ante annum trigessimum ?

An ex utero Reformationis effluxerint Cædes, rapinæ, direptiones templorum, tumultus, Schismata & bella civilia quæ emerunt anno 1641 ?

Utrum Africa feracior sit Monstrorum quam Britannia fanaticorum, ubi nulli non licet intelligere scripturas pro suo judicio discretionis?

Utrum Elisabetha ex Annâ Bolenâ suscepta, vivente adhuc Regina Katherinâ, legitimos habuit natales ?

Utrum laudanda sit sapientia Henrici VIII. qui expulso uno Papâ Romano suscitavit infinitos Papas ex suis subditis ?

Qua Autoritate uxorem suam Katherinam repudiavit Henricus ? Suâ vel alienâ ? si suâ, quidni possint & alii Reges prohibitu suas dimittere uxores ? quod si Maria filia ejus ex Katherinâ fuit legitima Regni hæres, ergo Elisabetha non fuit ; quia Henrico non licuit habere duas uxores simul.

Si nefas sit mutare Religionem Parliamentariâ Autoritate stabilitam, undè licuit Elisabethæ religionem evertere Catholicam Regni legibus stabilitam ? 14 Episcopos Catholicos è sedibus suis expulit Elisabetha ob recusatum juramentum Primatûs. At quomodo poterant jurare eam esse caput Ecclesiæ, quando non poterant jurare eam esse caput Regni ?

Nonne Liturgiam suam suffuratus est Cranmerus ex Missali, Rituali & Breviario Romano?

Nonne Juramento Primatus tenentur Protestantes obtemperare Regi ut supremo Gubernatori tam in omnibus spiritualibus sive Ecclesiasticis rebus aut causis quam in temporalibus, &c. quid sibi velunt hæc verba tam in omnibus spiritualibus quam temporalibus rebus aut causis, nisi ut Protestantes debeant Regi præstare omnimodam obedientiam tam religiosam quam civilem? Nonne ergo secundum hæc juramentum oportet eos esse Catholicos cum Rege Catholico, Calvinianos cum Calviniano, Arrianos cum Arriano? Dico secundum hæc juramentum, quia Regia Majestas est unicus supremus Gubernator tam in omnibus spiritualibus quam temporalibus rebus. Hæc verba agnoscunt in Rege primatum tam spiritualem quam civilem. At unde constabit ejus Jurisdictio spiritualis abq; potestate clavium?

Dices, obsequendum est Regi quantum licet per leges Dei & Regni; esto. Ergo Rex non est supremum sub Christo caput sed Scriptura & Statuta Regni. At si quando lis surrexerit inter Regem & subditos de vero sensu Scripturæ, Quis erit Judex? Spiritus privatus an non? hinc, ni fallor, origo & fomes bellorum civilium.

Cur Reformationem tam avidè amplexi sunt tot Nobiles sub Elizabetha? ob conscientiam an ob lucrum prædiorum Ecclesiasticorum?

Cur plebs Anglicana novitatis avida odit Papismum? forsitan quia Papismus non est novitas.

Ecclesia Anglicana vel est fallibilis vel infallibilis, si fallibilis sit (uti fatentur omnes) ergo non est fundata super Petram, quia potest falli & fallere.

Utrum sapienter fecit Cardinalis Wolsey evertendo Monasteria ut fundaret Collegia? ratio dubitandi est quia lignum scientiæ non fuit lignum vitæ.

Nonne in Ecclesia Anglicana desideratur versio Bibliorum multò emendatior & correctior? quia quam plurimis in lccis Vitiatur

tur textus in favorem carnis & gratiam Schismatis; exempli causâ. Gal. 5. 17. Dan. 4. 24. Ubi propheta allegitur Regem Nabuchadonosor sic, quamobrem, Rex, consilium meum placeat tibi, & peccata tua eleemosynis redime, & iniquitates tuas misericordiis pauperum. Quem textum ita reddunt Biblia Anglicana satis vitiosè, Wherefore O King, break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor. Cum verti oportuit, redeem thy sins by Alms deeds, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor. Præterea malè redduntur hæc verba Sancti Pauli ad Corinthios, 1 Cor. 7. 9. Quod si non se continent, nubant, but if they cannot contain, let them marry? Ubi hæc vox (cannot) excogitabatur in favorem carnis.

Rursus verba Christi corrumpuntur, Matth. 19. 11. propter indulgentiam carnis sic, non omnes capiunt verbum istud sed quibus datum est. All men [cannot] receive this saying but such to whom it is given. Deindè verba Jobi, cap. 7. 1. & alii textus non pauci præsertim, Exod. 20. 4. in odium imaginis Christi. Non facies tibi sculptile. Quæ vox sculptile à 70. bene vertitur idolum, quia Deus non prohibuit imagines sed Idola.

FINIS.



